

~~SECRET~~

53

24th November, 1959.

COCOM Document 3715.20/1B

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

RECORD OF DISCUSSION

CN

ITEM 1520 - RADIO RELAY COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT

3rd and 17th November 1959

Present: Belgium(Luxembourg), Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States.

References: COCOM Docs. Nos. 3700.2, .3 and .9, 3715.00/1 and W.P. 1520/1.

1. The GERMAN Delegation suggested that the exclusion clause be changed to read:

".....except equipment of types and series in civilian use for more than two years, specially designed for television and having none of the following characteristics:  
 (a) bandwidth greater than 5 Mc/s,  
 (b) non-linear distortion of less than 1%,  
 (c) phase constant of more than 400 millimicroseconds for a bandwidth of 5 Mc/s."

The German Delegate stated that the sole aim of this proposal was to exclude equipment used for television broadcasting. Television transmitters were free from embargo under the terms of Item 1517, and it was therefore only logical to free the equipment used for transmission. From the technical point of view, the German Delegation had tried to draw a distinction between relay equipment used only in television and relay equipment used for voice transmission. This distinction was a difficult one to make, but it was nonetheless true that television equipment was much simpler than that required for voice transmission.

2. The UNITED STATES Delegate then made a general statement on Sino-Soviet Bloc production and utilisation of the different types of communications equipment. (The text of this statement is to be found in COCOM Doc. 3700.9.) From the technical point of view, the United States Delegate stated that his experts had studied the possibility of making a distinction between television microwave relay equipment and the equipment used in telephony and that, on the basis of experience obtained in the United States, the same equipment could be put to both uses.

3. The FRENCH Delegate agreed to the German proposal and stressed that it was necessary throughout the whole communications equipment category to exclude the very narrow field of "equipment specially designed for television" which, in the view of the French experts, could not be used for communications purposes without great difficulty.

4. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate stated that he shared the German Delegation's desire to exclude television equipment from the embargo. Noting, however, that the present proposal did not make it possible to distinguish clearly between television and telephony equipment, the Delegate suggested that a Working Group be invited to draw up a satisfactory definition.

5. The NETHERLANDS Delegate stated that, in view of the technical difficulty encountered in distinguishing between the radio relay equipment used for television and that used for telephony, it might be advisable to establish a clause under which the Committee would give favourable consideration to

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

- 2 -

CCCOM Document 3715.20/1B

exception requests for the shipment of radio relay equipment in cases where it could be proved satisfactorily that this equipment was to be installed in a television network.

6. The COMMITTEE then agreed to invite a Technical Working Group to find a formula which would make it possible to exclude equipment used solely for television purposes from the radio relay equipment definition. At the close of its meeting, the Working Group noted that it was unable at the present time to reach agreement on a technical distinction between these types of equipment.

7. The COMMITTEE took note of these findings and of the German Delegation's intention to propose a form of wording in which, as the Netherlands Delegation had suggested, it would be stated that "the Committee will give favourable consideration to exception requests involving equipment in civilian use for more than two years, where it can be proved that such equipment will be installed in a television network recognised by the C.C.I.T., and moreover in the interests of the Free World."

8. CONCLUSION: The COMMITTEE noted that agreement had not been reached on Item 152C and agree to resume study of it during the second round of discussion.

SECRET